arXiv:1609.00215v1 [math.PR] 1 Sep 2016

New characterizations of the S topology on the Skorokhod space

Adam Jakubowski*
Nicolaus Copernicus University
adjakubo@mat.uni.torun.pl

September 2, 2016

Abstract

The S topology on the Skorokhod space was introduced by the author in 1997 and since then it proved to be a useful tool in several areas of the theory of stochastic processes. The paper brings complementary information on the S topology. It is shown that the convergence of sequences in the S topology admits a compact description, exhibiting the locally convex character of the S topology. It is also shown that S is, up to some technicalities, finer than any linear topology which is coarser than Skorokhod's J_1 topology.

Keywords: functional convergence of stochastic processes; S topology; J_1 topology; Skorokhod space; sequential spaces

AMS MSC 2000: 60F17; 60B11; 54D55; 54A10

1 Introduction

The S topology on the Skorokhod space $\mathbb{D} = \mathbb{D}([0,T])$ of càdlàg functions has emerged as a result of chain of observations made in eighties and nineties of the twentieth century.

In 1984 Meyer and Zheng [23] considered certain conditions on truncated variations of stochastic processes and proved that these conditions give uniform tightness of the processes in some topology (nowadays called the Meyer-Zheng topology) on $\mathbb{D}$.

*Supported by the Polish NCN grant no. 2012/07/B/ST1/03508

A year later Stricker [31] proved that it is possible to relax Meyer-Zheng conditions to uniform tightness of random variables $\{\|X_n\|_\infty\}$ and $\{N^{a,b}(X_n)\}$, for each pair of levels $a < b$ (where $N^{a,b}$ is the number of up-crossings of levels $a < b$).

Stricker still operated with the Meyer-Zheng topology. It was clear for Kurtz [16] that such conditions give much more. But an *ad hoc* device constructed by Kurtz *did not have a topological character*.

The S topology was constructed by the author in [10]. This step was final in the sense that Stricker's conditions are *equivalent* to the uniform tightness in the S topology.

It should be emphasized, that the S topology, as considered in [10], is sequential and it is still not known if it is completely regular. So at the moment of its creation there was no formalism to deal with it within the Probability Theory. Such formalism has been provided in [11]. And an efficient tool - the almost sure Skorokhod's representation in non-metric spaces, given in [9] - made the S topology an operational and useful device in many problems.

The very first application of the S topology was given by the author in [8], where convergence of stochastic integrals was considered. Later the S topology was used in problems related to homogenization of stochastic differential equations (e.g. [21], [24], [4], [1]), [30], [27]), diffusion approximation of solutions to the Poisson equation ([25]), Skorokhod problem ([19], [20], [29]), econometrics ([6]), control theory ([18], [2]) , linear models with heavy-tails ([3]), continuity of semilinear Neumann-Dirichlet problems ([22]), generalized Doob-Meyer decomposition ([12]), modeling stochastic reaction networks ([13]) and even in some considerations of more general character ([7], [17]).

In the present paper we provide some complementary information related to the S topology. Section 2 restates the definition and basic properties of the S topology. The S topology was defined in [10] by means of so-called $\mathcal{L}$-convergence $\longrightarrow_S$, which leads to the topological convergence $\overset{*}{\longrightarrow}_S$ via the Kantorovich-Vulih-Pinsker-Kisynski recipe (we refer to Section 5 for a primer on sequential spaces). In Section 3 we provide a compact formula for the $\overset{*}{\longrightarrow}_S$ convergence.

In Section 4 we find a position for S in the hierarchy of topologies on $\mathbb{D}$, by showing that it is *essentially* finer than any linear topology which is coarser than the Skorokhod's J_1 topology.

2 Definition of the S topology

All results in this section are taken from [10]. We need some notation first.

1. $\mathbb{D} = \mathbb{D}([0,T])$ denotes the Skorokhod space, i.e. a family of functions $x : [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}^1$, which are right-continuous at every $t \in [0,T)$ and admit left-limits at every $t \in (0,T]$.
2. $\|x\|_\infty$ is the *sup-norm* on $\mathbb{D}$.
3. For $a < b$, $N^{a,b}$ is *the number of up-crossings of levels a and b.*
4. For $\eta > 0$, N_η is *the number of η-oscillations* on $[0,T]$.
5. $\|v\|(T)$ is *the total variation of v on* $[0,T]$:

$$\|v\|(T) = \sup\big\{|v(0)| + \sum_{i=1}^{m} |v(t_i) - v(t_{i-1})|\big\},$$

   where the supremum is taken over all $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \ldots < t_m = T$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$.
6. $\mathbb{V} = \big\{x \in \mathbb{D}\,;\, \|x\|(T) < +\infty\big\}$.

Lemma 2.1 (Equivalent criteria of compactness in $\mathbb{D}$)**.** *Let $K \subset \mathbb{D}$. Assume that*

$$\sup_{x\in K} \|x\|_\infty < +\infty. \tag{1}$$

Then the following conditions are equivalent:

$$\textit{For all } a < b \quad \sup_{x\in K} N^{a,b}(x) < +\infty. \tag{2}$$

$$\textit{For every } \eta > 0 \quad \sup_{x\in K} N_\eta(x) < +\infty. \tag{3}$$

Moreover, any of the pairs of conditions (1)+(2) and (1)+(3) is equivalent to the following statement: For every $\varepsilon > 0$ and every $x \in K$ there exists $v_{x,\varepsilon} \in \mathbb{V}$ such that

$$\sup_{x\in K} \|x - v_{x,\varepsilon}\|_\infty \le \varepsilon, \tag{4}$$

and

$$\sup_{x\in K} \|v_{x,\varepsilon}\| < +\infty. \tag{5}$$

Definition 2.2 (S-convergence)**.** We shall write $x_n \to_S x_0$ if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ one can find elements $v_{n,\varepsilon} \in \mathbb{V}$, $n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$ which are ε-uniformly close to x_n's and weakly-$*$ convergent:

$$\|x_n - v_{n,\varepsilon}\|_\infty \le \varepsilon, \qquad n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, \tag{6}$$

$$v_{n,\varepsilon} \Rightarrow v_{0,\varepsilon}, \qquad \text{as } n \to \infty. \tag{7}$$

Recall, that $v_n \Rightarrow v_0$ means that

$$\int_{[0,T]} f(t)\, dv_n \to \int_{[0,T]} f(t)\, dv_0(t),$$

for each continuous function $f : [0, T] \to \mathbb{R}^1$.

Theorem 2.3. *(Criterion of relative S-compactness) Let $K \subset \mathbb{D}$. We can find in every sequence $\{x_n\}$ of elements of K a subsequence $\{x_{n_k}\}$ such that $x_{n_k} \longrightarrow_S x_0$, as $k \to \infty$, if, and only if, one of the equivalent sets of conditions mentioned in the previous lemma is satisfied.*

Definition 2.4 (The S topology)**.** The S topology is the sequential topology on $\mathbb{D}$ generated by the $\mathcal{L}$-convergence $\longrightarrow_S$.

Remark 2.5. " $\longrightarrow_S$ " is not an $\mathcal{L}^*$-convergence. In the next section we give a compact form of " $\overset{*}{\longrightarrow}_S$ ", obtained from $\longrightarrow_S$ by the KVPK recipe (Theorem 5.3).

3 Compact definition of $\overset{*}{\longrightarrow}_S$

Definition 3.1. Let $\mathbb{A}$ be a family of *continuous* functions of *finite variation* ($\mathbb{A} \subset C([0, T]) \cap \mathbb{V}$), satisfying $A(0) = 0$.

Let $A_n \in \mathbb{A}, n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$. We will say that $A_n \longrightarrow_\tau A_0$, if

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} |A_n(t) - A_0(t)| \to 0,$$

and

$$\sup_n \|A_n\|(T) < +\infty.$$

Remark 3.2. This is a "mixed topology" on $C([0, T]) \cap \mathbb{V}$.

Theorem 3.3. *$x_n \overset{*}{\longrightarrow}_S x_0$ if, and only if, $x_n(T) \to x_0(T)$ and*

$$\int_0^T x_n(u)\, dA_n(u) \to \int_0^T x_0(u)\, dA_0(u), \tag{8}$$

for each sequence $A_n \longrightarrow_\tau A_0$.

Proof. Suppose that $x_n \overset{*}{\longrightarrow}_S x_0$. Then $x_n(T) \to x_0(T)$ is a direct consequence of the definition of $\longrightarrow_S$. Now let $A_n \longrightarrow_\tau A_0$. Then (8) is a very particular (deterministic) case of Theorem 1 (or Theorem 5) in [8].

So let us assume that $x_n(T) \to x_0(T)$ and (8) holds for every sequence $A_n \longrightarrow_\tau A_0$. We claim that it is enough to establish relative S-compactness of $\{x_n\}$. Indeed, then in every subsequence $\{n'\}$ we can find a further subsequence $\{n''\}$ such that $x_{n''} \longrightarrow_S y_0$, for some $y_0 \in \mathbb{D}$. Take a function $f \in L^1([0,T])$ and define $A_f(t) = \int_0^t f(u)\,du$. Then $A_f \in \mathbb{A}$ and by the first part of the proof,

$$\int_0^T x_{n''}(u)\,dA_f(u) \to \int_0^T y_0(u)\,dA_f(u) = \int_0^T x_0(u)\,dA_f(u).$$

Hence for each integrable f we have

$$\int_0^T y_0(u)f(u)\,du = \int_0^T y_0(u)\,dA_f(u) = \int_0^T x_0(u)\,dA_f(u) = \int_0^T x_0(u)f(u)\,du,$$

and, consequently, $y_0 = x_0$ almost surely. Since they are càdlàg functions, $y_0 = x_0$ on $[0,T)$. And $y_0(T) = x_0(T)$ by assumption. We have proved that in every subsequence $\{n'\}$ we can find a further subsequence $\{n''\}$ along which $x_{n''} \longrightarrow_S x_0$. Hence, by the KVPK recipe, $x_n \overset{*}{\longrightarrow}_S x_0$.

In order to prove relative S-compactness of $\{x_n\}$ it is necessary to adjust integrands A_n in a way suitable for the particular functional determining the relative S-compactness via Lemma 2.1.

For example, consider condition (1). Suppose that $\sup_n \|x_n\|_\infty = +\infty$. Then there exists a subsequence n_k and numbers $t_k \in [0,T)$ such that $a_k = |x_{n_k}(t_k)| \to \infty$. Without loss of generality we may assume that $a_k = x_{n_k}(t_k)$. By the right-continuity of x_{n_k} we can find numbers h_k such that $t_k + h_k < T$ and

$$x_{n_k}(t) \geq (1/2)a_k, \qquad \text{for } t \in [t_k, t_k + h_k].$$

Let $b_k = \sqrt{a_k}h_k$. Consider function $f_k(u) = (1/b_k)I\!I_{[t_k,t_k+h_k]}$ and the corresponding function $A_{f_k} \in \mathbb{A}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^T x_{n_k}(u)\,dA_{f_k}(u) &= \int_0^T x_{n_k}(u)f_k(u)\,du \\ &= \frac{1}{b_k}\int_{t_k}^{t_k+h_k} x_{n_k}(u)\,du \geq \frac{a_k h_k}{2b_k} = (1/2)\sqrt{a_k} \to +\infty,\end{aligned}$$

while

$$\|A_{f_k}\|_\infty = \|A_{f_k}\|(T) = \int_0^T f_k(u)\,du = h_k/b_k = 1/\sqrt{a_k} \to 0.$$

It follows that (8) cannot be satisfied.

In a similar way we deal with condition (3). We leave this simple, but arduous, reasoning to the reader. □

Corollary 3.4. *$x_n \overset{*}{\longrightarrow}_S x_0$ if, and only if, $x_n(T) \to x_0(T)$ and for each relatively τ-compact set $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{A}$*

$$\sup_{A\in\mathcal{A}} \Big| \int_0^T \big(x_n(u) - x_0(u)\big)\, dA(u)\Big| \to 0. \tag{9}$$

Proof. Clearly, (9) implies (8). To prove the converse, assume (8) and suppose that (9) does not hold for some relatively τ-compact set $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{A}$. This means that for some $\eta > 0$ there exists a subsequence $\{n'\}$ and elements $A_{n'}$ of $\mathcal{A}$ such that for all n'

$$\Big| \int_0^T \big(x_{n'}(u) - x_0(u)\big)\, dA_{n'}(u)\Big| > \eta.$$

Passing to a τ-convergent subsequence $A_{n''}$ we obtain a contradiction with (8). □

Remark 3.5. Denote by Σ the locally convex topology on $\mathbb{D}$ given by the seminorm $\rho_1(x) = |x(1)|$ and the seminorms

$$\rho_{\mathcal{A}}(x) = \sup_{A\in\mathcal{A}} \Big| \int_0^1 x(u)\, dA(u)\Big|,$$

where $\mathcal{A}$ runs over relatively τ-compact subsets of $\mathbb{A}$.

Then $x_n \overset{*}{\longrightarrow}_S x_0$ if, and only if, $x_n \longrightarrow_\Sigma x_0$ and so $S \supset \Sigma$, for S is sequential.

Question 3.6. Is it true that $S \equiv \Sigma$? Positive answer would allow to state that $(\mathbb{D}, S)$ is a locally convex linear topological space.

4 S in the hierarchy of topologies

Let us begin with listing some facts on topologies on $\mathbb{D}$.

1. $\mathbb{D}$ with norm $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ is a Banach space, but non-separable.
2. The Skorokhod's J_1 topology is metric separable and $\big(\mathbb{D}, J_1\big)$ is topologically complete. For definition and properties of J_1 we refer to Billingsley's classic book [5] rather than to its second edition.

3. It is easy to show that $x_n \longrightarrow_{J_1} x_0$ implies $x_n \longrightarrow_S x_0$, hence the S topology is coarser than J_1.

4. It was shown in [3] that the S topology is coarser than Skorokhod's M_1 topology (see [28] for definitions of four Skorokhod's topologies).

5. S is incomparable with Skorokhod's M_2 topology!

6. $\big(\mathbb{D}, J_1\big)$ *is not a linear topological space*, for addition is not sequentially J_1-continuous, as Figure 1 shows.

7. On the contrary, the sequence $\{f_n\}$ defined in Figure 1 is S-convergent to 0 and exhibits a typical for S phenomenon of self-cancelling oscillations. Addition is *sequentially continuous* in S!

8. We do not know, whether addition is *continuos*, as a function on the product $\mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{D}$ with *product topology* $S \times S$ (in general sequential continuity does not imply continuity). Therefore we do not know, whether $(\mathbb{D}, S)$ is a linear topological space.



Figure 1: J_1 is not linear

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose σ is a topology on $\mathbb{D} = \mathbb{D}([0,T])$ which satisfies the*

following assumptions.

$$(\mathbb{D}, \sigma) \text{ is a linear topological space} \tag{10}$$

$$\sigma \text{ is coarser than the uniform topology generated by the norm } \|\cdot\|_\infty. \tag{11}$$

$$\text{For each } A > 0 \text{ the set } \{a\mathbb{1}_{[u,T]}\,;\, |a| \le A, u \in [0,T]\} \text{ is relatively } \sigma\text{-compact.} \tag{12}$$

Then σ is coarser than the S topology.

Proof. We claim that it is enough to prove that $x_n \longrightarrow_S x_0$ implies $x_{n'} \longrightarrow_\sigma x_0$ along some subsequence $\{n'\}$. Indeed, this implies that any σ_s-closed set is also S-closed (for S is sequential), and so σ_s is coarser than S. Since we always have $\sigma \subset \sigma_s$, our claim follows.

So let us assume that $x_n \longrightarrow_S x_0$. For $\varepsilon > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{D}$ let us define

$$\tau_0^\varepsilon(x) = 0$$
$$\tau_k^\varepsilon(x) = \inf\{t > \tau_{k-1}^\varepsilon(x) : |x(t) - x(\tau_{k-1}^\varepsilon(x))| > \varepsilon\},\ k = 1, 2, \ldots.$$

(where by convention $\inf \emptyset = +\infty$) and let

$$v_\varepsilon(x)(t) = x(\tau_k^\varepsilon(x)) \ \text{ if } \tau_k^\varepsilon(x) \le t < \tau_{k+1}^\varepsilon(x),\ t \in [0,T], k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots.$$

Then by the very definition $\|x - v_\varepsilon(x)\|_\infty \le \varepsilon$. Similarly, if we set

$$M^\varepsilon(x) = \max\{k\,;\, \tau_k^\varepsilon(x) \le T.\}$$

then $M^\varepsilon(x) \le N_{\varepsilon/2}(x)$ and by Theorem 2.3 and Lemma 2.1 we have

$$\sup_n \|v_\varepsilon(x_n)\|_\infty \le \varepsilon + \sup_n \|x_n\|_\infty =: A_\varepsilon < +\infty. \tag{13}$$

$$\sup_n M^\varepsilon(x_n) \le \sup_n N_{\varepsilon/2}(x_n) =: M_\epsilon < +\infty. \tag{14}$$

Since $v_\varepsilon(x)$ varies only through $M^\varepsilon(x)$ jumps, it can be represented as a sum of $M^\varepsilon(x) + 1$ terms:

$$v_\varepsilon(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{M^\varepsilon(x)} z_k(x)\mathbb{1}_{[\tau_k^\varepsilon(x), T]}, \tag{15}$$

where $z_0(x) = 0$ and

$$z_k(x) = x\big(\tau_k^\varepsilon(x)\big) - \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} x\big(\tau_j^\varepsilon(x)\big) \quad k = 1, 2, \ldots, M^\varepsilon(x).$$

By (13) and (14) we obtain

$$\sup_n \max_k |z_k(x_n)| \leq (M_\varepsilon + 1)A_\varepsilon.$$

It follows that the sequence $\{v_\varepsilon(x_n)\}$ lives in the algebraic sum

$$\widetilde{K}_\varepsilon = \underbrace{K_\varepsilon + K_\varepsilon + \ldots + K_\varepsilon}_{M_\varepsilon+1 \text{ times}},$$

where $K_\varepsilon = \{a\mathbb{I}_{[u,T]}\,;\, |a| \leq \big(M_\varepsilon + 1\big)A_\varepsilon, u \in [0,T]\}$ is relatively σ-compact. Since $(\mathbb{D}, \sigma)$ is linear $\widetilde{K}_\varepsilon$ is relatively σ-compact as well. This means that in every subsequence $\{n'\}$ one can find a further subsequence $\{n''\}$ such that $v_\varepsilon(x_{n''}) \longrightarrow_\sigma v_\varepsilon$, for some $v_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{D}$. But we can say more: by the special form (15) of elements $v_\varepsilon(x_n)$ (bounded number of jumps with bounded amplitudes) we may extract a further subsequence $\{n'''\}$ such that $v_\varepsilon(x_{n'''}) \Rightarrow v_\varepsilon$.

Now choose $\varepsilon_m \searrow 0$ and apply the diagonal procedure to extract a subsequence n' such that for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have along $\{n'\}$

$$v_{\varepsilon_m}(x_{n'}) \underset{\sigma}{\longrightarrow} v_m, \qquad v_{\varepsilon_m}(x_{n'}) \Rightarrow v_m$$

for some $v_m = v_{\varepsilon_m} \in \mathbb{D}$. Notice that $v_{\varepsilon_m}(x_{n'}) \Rightarrow v_m$ implies $v_{\varepsilon_m}(x_{n'}) \longrightarrow_S v_m$. By Corollary 2.10 in [10]

$$\|v_m - x_0\|_\infty \leq \liminf_{n'} \|v_{\varepsilon_m}(x_{n'}) - x_{n'}\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon_m \to 0. \tag{16}$$

For later purposes we may write $v_m - x_0 \in B_{\varepsilon_m}$, where $B_r = \{x \in \mathbb{D}\,;\, \|x\|_\infty \leq r\}$ for $r > 0$.

Our final task consists in proving $x_{n'} \longrightarrow_\sigma x_0$. Let V be a σ-open neighborhood of x_0. By the linearity there exists a σ-open neighborhood W of 0 such that $W + W \subset V - x_0$. Since σ is coarser than the uniform topology, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $B_{2\delta} \subset W$. Let m be such that $\varepsilon_m < \delta$. Then for n' large enough we have

$$\begin{aligned} x_{n'} &= x_{n'} - v_{\varepsilon_m}(x_{n'}) + v_{\varepsilon_m}(x_{n'}) - v_m + v_m - x_0 + x_0 \\ &\in B_{\varepsilon_m} + W + B_{\varepsilon_m} + x_0 \subset W + W + x_0 \subset V. \end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 4.2. Let us consider the space $L^p([0,T]) = L^p\big([0,T], \mathcal{L}|_{[0,T]}, \ell|_{[0,T]}\big)$, $p \in [0, +\infty]$ of Lebesgue-measurable functions on $[0,T]$ (here ℓ stands for the Lebesgue measure). Of course, for each p we have $\mathbb{D}([0,T]) \subset L^p([0,T])$.

Moreover, the induced metric converts $\mathbb{D}([0,T])$ into a normed space (if $p \in [1,+\infty)$) or a metric linear space (if $p \in [0,1]$). Clearly, assumptions (10) - (12) are satisfied and by our Theorem 4.1 all mentioned metric topologies are coarser than S.

Remark 4.3. If we replace ℓ with another *atomless* finite measure μ on $[0,T]$, then again the metric topologies induced by spaces $L^p([0,T],\mu)$, $p \in [0,+\infty)$, are coarser than the S topology.

This is not so, if we admit atoms for μ, for (12) is then violated.

Remark 4.4. In Introduction we suggested that the S topology is *almost* finer than any linear topology which is coarser than Skorokhod's J_1 topology. The delicate point is that condition (12) does not hold for J_1. The corresponding typical example is given in Figure 2, with parameters $t_n \to 0$. To overcome this difficulty we shall introduce a variant of the J_1 topology, called mJ_1 (m - for modified), which slightly weakens the original topology and for which condition (12) is satisfied.



Figure 2: A sequence of single jumps that does not converge in J_1, but converges in mJ_1

Definition 4.5 (The mJ_1 topology)**.** Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and consider a one-to-one embedding

$$\mathbb{D}([0,T]) \ni x \mapsto \widetilde{x} \in \mathbb{D}([-\varepsilon, T+\varepsilon])$$

given by the formula

$$\widetilde{x}(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if} \quad -\varepsilon \le t < 0, \\ x(t) & \text{if} \quad 0 \le t < T, \\ x(T) & \text{if} \quad T \le t \le T + \varepsilon. \end{cases} \tag{17}$$

Take the complete metric d_{Sk} on $\mathbb{D}([-\varepsilon, T+\varepsilon])$ (see [5])) and define

$$d(x,y) = d_{Sk}\big(\widetilde{x}, \widetilde{y}\big).$$

Then $(\mathbb{D}, d)$ becomes a metric space and the corresponding topology will be called mJ_1.

Theorem 4.6 (Basic facts on mJ_1)**.**

(i) $(\mathbb{D}, d)$ *is a Polish (i.e. complete and separable) metric space.*

(ii) *A subset $K \subset \mathbb{D}$ is relatively mJ_1-compact iff it is uniformly bounded:*

$$\sup_{x \in K} \sup_{t \in [0,T]} |x(t)| < +\infty, \tag{18}$$

and

$$\lim_{\delta \to 0} \sup_{x \in K} \sup_{\substack{0 - \le s < t < u \le T \\ u - s < \delta}} \min\{|x(t) - x(s)|, |x(u) - x(t)|\} = 0, \tag{19}$$

where we use the conventions $x(0-) = 0$ and $u - (0-) = u$.

(iii) *For each $A > 0$ the set $\{a\mathbb{I}_{[u,T]}\,;\, |a| \le A, u \in [0,T]\}$ is relatively mJ_1-compact.*

Proof. It is easy to see that if $\widetilde{x}_n$ converges in $\big(\mathbb{D}([-\varepsilon, T+\varepsilon]), d_{Sk}\big)$ to some z, then the limit is of the form $\widetilde{x}_0$, for some $x_0 \in \mathbb{D}$. Hence $(\mathbb{D}, d)$ is homeomorphic to the closed subset of the Polish space $\big(\mathbb{D}([-\varepsilon, T+\varepsilon]), d_{Sk}\big)$, and so it is Polish itself.

Part (ii) is a specification of Theorem 14.4 in [5].

And part (iii) is a direct consequence of our definition (see Figure 2).

□

Taking into account Theorems 4.1 and 4.6 we obtain the following interesting result, positioning the S topology in the hierarchy of topologies on $\mathbb{D}$.

Theorem 4.7 (Maximal character of the S topology)**.** *Every linear topology on $\mathbb{D}$, which is coarser than mJ_1, is coarser than the S topology as well.*

Remark 4.8. Were $\big(\mathbb{D}, S\big)$ a linear topological space, S would be the finest linear topology on $\mathbb{D}$ "below" mJ_1.

5 Appendix: Sequential topologies generated by $\mathcal{L}$-convergences

Following Fréchet, we say that $\mathcal{X}$ is a space of type $\mathcal{L}$, if among all sequences of elements of $\mathcal{X}$ a class $\mathcal{C}(\to)$ of "convergent" sequences is distinguished in such a way that:

(i) To each convergent sequence (x_n) exactly one point x_0, called "the limit", is attached (symbolically: $x_n \longrightarrow x_0$)

(ii) For every $x \in \mathcal{X}$, the constant sequence $(x, x, \ldots)$ is convergent to x.

(iii) If $x_n \longrightarrow x_0$ and $1 \leq n_1 < n_2 < \ldots$, then the subsequence (x_{n_k}) converges, and to the same limit: $x_{n_k} \longrightarrow x_0$, as $k \to \infty$.

Using the $\mathcal{L}$-convergence $\longrightarrow$ one creates the family of closed sets.

Definition 5.1. Say that $F \subset \mathcal{X}$ is $\tau(\to)$-closed if limits of $\longrightarrow$-convergent sequences of elements of F remain in F, i.e. if $x_n \in F$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x_n \longrightarrow x_0$, then $x_0 \in F$. The topology given by $\tau(\to)$-closed sets is called the sequential topology generated by the $\mathcal{L}$-convergence $\longrightarrow$ and will be denoted by $\tau(\to)$.

Remark 5.2. It must be stressed that for a sequential topology to be defined only the extremely simple properties (ii) and (iii) of convergence $\longrightarrow$ are required. On the other hand, obtained this way topology has in general extremely poor separation properties. It is only T1 space due to the fact that in view of (ii) above each one-point set $\{x\}$ is $\tau(\to)$-closed.

But it is enough for the topology $\tau(\to)$ to define a new (in general) convergence, "$\longrightarrow_{\tau(\to)}$" say, which, after Urysohn, is called the convergence "a posteriori", in order to distinguish from the original convergence (= convergence "a priori", i.e. "$\longrightarrow$"). So (x_n) converges *a posteriori* to x_0, if for every $\tau(\to)$-open set U containing x_0 eventually all elements of the sequence (x_n) belong to U.

Kantorovich *et al* [14, Theorem 2.42, p.51] and Kisyński [15] gave a familiar characterization of the convergence *a posteriori* in terms of the convergence *a priori*.

Theorem 5.3 (KVPK recipe)**.** $\{x_n\}$ *converges to* x_0 a posteriori *if, and only if, each subsequence* $\{x_{n_k}\}$ *contains a further subsequence* $\{x_{n_{k_l}}\}$ *convergent to* x_0 a priori.

Remark 5.4. The convergence *a posteriori* is generated by a topology. Suppose an $\mathcal{L}$-convergence $\longrightarrow$ satisfies additionally

(iv) If every subsequence (x_{n_k}) of (x_n) contains a further subsequence $(x_{n_{k_l}})$ $\longrightarrow$-convergent to x_0, then the whole sequence (x_n) is $\longrightarrow$-convergent to x_0.

Then the convergence $\longrightarrow$ is called an $\mathcal{L}^*$-convergence. It is an immediate consequence of Theorem 5.3 that if we start with an $\mathcal{L}^*$-convergence then the convergences *a posteriori* and *a priori* coincide.

Remark 5.5. It follows that given an $\mathcal{L}$-convergence "$\longrightarrow$" we can *weaken* it to an $\mathcal{L}^*$-convergence "$\overset{*}{\longrightarrow}$" which is already the usual convergence of sequences in the topological space $(\mathcal{X}, \tau(\longrightarrow)) \equiv (\mathcal{X}, \tau(\overset{*}{\rightarrow}))$. At least two examples of such a procedure are commonly known.

Example 5.6. If "$\longrightarrow$" denotes the convergence "almost surely" of real random variables defined on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, then "$\overset{*}{\longrightarrow}$" is the convergence "in probability".

Example 5.7. Let $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^1$ and take a sequence $\varepsilon_n \searrow 0$. Say that $x_n \longrightarrow x_0$, if for each $n \in \mathbb{N}, |x_n - x_0| < \varepsilon_n$, i.e. x_n converges to x_0 at the given rate $\{\varepsilon_n\}$. Then "$\overset{*}{\longrightarrow}$" means the usual convergence of real numbers.

Remark 5.8. It is worth to realize that a set $J \subset \mathcal{X}$ is relatively $\longrightarrow$-compact (i.e. in each sequence $\{x_n\} \subset J$ one can find a subsequence $\{n'\}$ such that $x_{n'} \longrightarrow x_0$, for some $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$) iff it is relatively $\overset{*}{\longrightarrow}$-compact.

Remark 5.9. Let us notice that if $(\mathcal{X}, \tau)$ is a Hausdorff topological space, then

$$\tau \subset \tau_s \equiv \tau(\underset{\tau}{\longrightarrow})$$

and in general this inclusion may be strict (like in the case of weak topology on an infinite dimensional Hilbert space).

References

[1] Bahlali, K., Elouaflin, A., Pardoux, E.: Homogenization of semilinear PDEs with discontinuous averaged coefficients. *Electron. J. Probab.* **14** (2009), 477-499.

[2] Bahlali, K., Gherbal, B., Mezerdi, B.: Existence of optimal controls for systems driven by FBSDEs. *Systems Control Lett.* **60** (2011), 344–349.

[3] Balan, R., Jakubowski, A. and Louhichi, S.: Functional Convergence of Linear Processes with Heavy-Tailed Innovations. *J. Theoret. Probab.* **29** (2016) , 491–526.

[4] Bencherérif-Madani, A., Pardoux, E.: Homogenization of a semilinear parabolic PDE with locally periodic coefficients: a probabilistic approach. *ESAIM. Probab. Stat.* **11** (2007), 385–411.

[5] Billingsley, P.: Convergence of Probability Measures. *Wiley*, New York 1968.

[6] Chan, N.H., Zhang, R.M.: Inference for unit-root models with infinite variance GARCH errors. *Statist. Sinica* **20** (2010), 1363–1393.

[7] Costantini, C., Kurtz, T.; Viscosity methods giving uniqueness for martingale problems. *Electron. J. Probab.* **20** (2015), No 67, 1–27.

[8] Jakubowski, A.: Convergence in various topologies for stochastic integrals driven by semimartingales. *Ann. Probab.*, **24** (1996), 2141–2153.

[9] Jakubowski, A.: The a.s. Skorohod representation for subsequences in nonmetric spaces. *Teor. Veroyatn. Primen.* **42** (1997), 209–216. SIAM translation: *Theory Probab. Appl.* **42** (1998), 167–174.

[10] Jakubowski, A.: A non-Skorohod topology on the Skorohod space. *Electron. J. Probab.*, **2** (1997), No 4, 1–21.

[11] Jakubowski, A.: From convergence of functions to convergence of stochastic processes. On Skorokhod's sequential approach to convergence in distribution. In: Korolyuk, V., Portenko, N. and Syta, H., Eds., Skorokhod's Ideas in Probability Theory, *Insitute of Mathematics, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine*, Kyiv 2000 , 179-194.

[12] Jakubowski, A.: Towards a general Doob-Meyer decomposition theorem. *Probab. Math. Statist.* **26** (2006), 143-153.

[13] Kang, H.W., Kurtz, T.: Separation of time-scales and model reduction for stochastic networks. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **23** (2013), 529–583.

[14] Kantorowich, L.V., Vulih, B.Z., Pinsker, A.G.: Functional Analysis in Partially Ordered Spaces. *Gostekhizdat*, Moscow 1950. (in Russian)

[15] Kisyński, J.: Convergence du type L. *Colloq. Math.*, **7** (1960), 205–211.

[16] Kurtz, T.: Random time changes and convergence in distribution under the Meyer-Zheng conditions, *Ann. Probab.* **19** (1991), 1010–1034.

[17] Kurtz, T.: Weak and strong solutions of general stochastic models. *Electron. Commun. Probab.* **19** (2014), no 58, 1–16.

[18] Kurtz, T., Stockbridge, R.H.: Stationary Solutions and Forward Equations for Controlled and Singular Martingale Problems. *Electron. J. Probab.*, **6** (2001), No 17, 1–52.

[19] Łaukajtys, W., Słomiński, L.: Penalization methods for reflecting stochastic differential equations with jumps. *Stochastics Stoch. Reports* **75**, (2003), 275–293.

[20] Łaukajtys, W., Słomiński, L.: Penalization methods for the Skorokhod problem and reflecting SDEs with jumps. *Bernoulli* **19** (2013), 1750–1775.

[21] Lejay, A.: BSDE driven by Dirichlet process and semi-linear parabolic PDE. Application to homogenization. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **97** (2002), 1–39.

[22] Maticiucic, L., Răşcanu, A.: On the continuity of the probabilistic representation of a semilinear Neumann-Dirichlet problem. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **126** (2016), 572–607.

[23] Meyer, P.A., Zheng, W.A.: Tightness criteria for laws of semimartingales, *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré B*, **20** (1984), 353–372.

[24] Ouknine, Y., Pardoux, E.: Homogenization of PDEs with nonlinear boundary condition. In: Dalang. C. et al.: Seminar on Stochastic Analysis, Random Fields and Applications III, *Birkhäuser*, Basel 2002, 229–242.

[25] Pardoux, E., Veretennikov, A. Yu.: On the Poisson equation and diffusion approximation. *Ann. Probab.* **13** (2005), 1111–1133.

[26] Pestman, W.R.: Measurability of linear operators in the Skorokhod topology. *Bull. Belg. Math. Soc.* **2** (1995), 381–388.

[27] Rhodes, R.: Stochastic homogenization of reflected stochastic differential equations. *Electron. J. Probab.* **15** (2010), 989–1023.

[28] Skorohod, A.V.: Limit theorems for stochastic processes, *Theor. Probab. Appl.*, **1** (1956), 261–290.

[29] Słomiński, L.: On reflected Stratonovich stochastic differential equations. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **125** (2015), 759–779.

[30] Sow, A.B., Rhodes, R., Pardoux, E.: Homogenization of periodic semilinear parabolic degenerate PDEs. *Ann. I. H. Poincaré AN* **26** (2009), 979–998.

[31] Stricker, C.: Lois de semimartingales et critères de compacité. In: *Séminares de probabilités XIX. Lect. Notes in Math.* **1123**, *Springer*, Berlin 1985, 209–217.